

Date: Mon, 8 Aug 94 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #359  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 8 Aug 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 359

Today's Topics:

What happened in 1987? (2 msgs)  
What is wrong with ha

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 8 Aug 1994 02:32:04 GMT  
From: cs.utexas.edu!news.tamu.edu!furuta@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: What happened in 1987?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <bmicales.204.2E45850A@facstaff.wisc.edu>,  
Bruce Micales <bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu> wrote:  
>reading the FCC rules. The only thing that I can say was yes there was a  
>further simplification in 1991. This is when the FCC created the  
>Technician ("no-code Tech") and therefore dropped the 5 wpm element (1A).

There was no change in the written exam when the NoCode Tech license was  
created. It's self evident that 1A was no longer required (why call it NoCode  
otherwise :- ) , but the element 2 and 3a tests were unchanged, HF questions  
and all.

--Rick  
KE3IV

-----

Date: Sun, 7 Aug 94 23:28:18 -0500  
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: What happened in 1987?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> writes:

>I, among others, have been guilty of lumping the easing of the Tech  
>written (in 1987) with the creation of the no-code Tech (it's part of  
>the vernacular, guys!) in 1991. Would someone who knows the whys and  
>wherefores please explain why the Tech written was simplified? Did it  
>all happen in 1987, or was there further simplification in 1991? What  
>was the justification?

As part of the "Novice Enhancement" rulemaking in 1987, in which the FCC revised Novice and Technician privileges, the Commission added questions to the Novice syllabus to reflect the new privileges and divided the single Technician/General syllabus into two separate exams to, in its view, have each exam better reflect the different privileges granted by the two licenses.

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Aug 94 22:42:00 -0800  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!iat.holonet.net!alley.com!john.hiatt@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: What is wrong with ha  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

DZC>Hey bud! Your callsign, K0TER, sounds like "Cooter", that character  
DZC>from The Dukes Of Hazard. I think he was the policeman. Anyways, it  
DZC>made me laugh.

Cooter was the gas station attendant/mechanic. You thinking of Rosco  
Pecole Train or whatever his name was.

John

---  
\* OLX 2.1 TD \* It took an hour to bury the cat. Silly thing kept moving

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #359  
\*\*\*\*\*